UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,585	03/15/2004	Jose Madeira De Freitas Garcia	G&C 30566.319-US-01	1655

55895   7590   04/24/2008
GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER
ORR, HENRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/800,585
Filing Date: March 15, 2004
Appellant(s): GARCIA ET AL.

George H. Gates
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed January 28, 2008 appealing from the Office

action mailed July 6, 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial

proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the

Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contains a grammatical error (i.e., Bonney

U.S. Patent No. ~~6,339,439~~ (Bonney) should be U.S. Patent No. **6,466,953** (Bonney)),

otherwise the statement in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The amendment after final rejection filed on 12/10/2007 has been entered.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contains a grammatical error (i.e.,

Bonney U.S. Patent No. ~~6,339,439~~ (Bonney) should be U.S. Patent No. **6,466,953**

(Bonney)), otherwise the statement in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is

correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,466,953	Bonney et al.	10-2002
2004/0177089	Love et al.	9-2004
2003/0031380	Song	2-2003
2003/0043177	Kawai	3-2003

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 12-14 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bonney et al. (hereinafter "Bonney"), U.S. Patent No. 6,466,953

B1, in view of Love et al. (hereinafter "Love"), U.S. Publication No. 2004/0177089.

Claim 1:

Bonny teaches a graphic program such as a computer aided design application

program (see abstract). **(claim 1; i.e., performing one or more functions of a Sheet**

Set Manager in the graphics program) Examiner interprets the computer aided

design application program to be capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager (see

abstract).

Bonney teaches *"Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models*

such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of

each of the models" (see col. 1 lines 26-30). **(claim 1; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set**

Manager manages a one or more Sheet Sets, each of the Sheet Sets comprises a

collection of zero or more Sheets and Subsets of the Sheets, each of the Sheets

comprises a drawing, layout or view, and the Sheet Set Manager manages one or

more different views for the Sheets.) Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of

drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney fails to expressly teach presenting a user with a list of views defined in a

Sheet set and the user placing a view from the list onto a Sheet.

However, Love teaches a user can select a view from a list of views and display

the drawing ("sheet") containing the selected view (see par. 58). **(claim 1; i.e., wherein**

the function comprises an Automatic View Creation, such that the Sheet Set

Manager presents a user with a list of the views defined in the Sheet Set and the user places a view from the list onto a Sheet to invoke the Automatic View Creation).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manage the views of the drawings generated by Bonney's computer aided program with the list of views as taught by Love to provide the benefit of an effective identification of separate views in a drawing (see Love; par. 2, par. 7).

Claim 2:

Bonney fails to expressly teach re-defining the boundaries of the views after creation.

However, Love teaches *"the boundary is a bounding rectangle, the step of dividing the boundary to define a plurality of view areas comprising splitting the bounding rectangle to define a plurality of view rectangles"* (see par. 21-23). **(claim 2; i.e., wherein boundaries for the views are re-defined after creation.)** Examiner considers the boundary of the rectangle view as already created. Then the boundary of the rectangle view is split to define a plurality of view rectangles, which is considered re-defining the boundaries with the plurality view rectangles.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the views in the drawings generated by Bonney's computer aided program using the redefining method as taught by Love to provide the benefit of reducing costs by being able to retrieve drawings of existing components from

a database of drawings in a computer aided design system (see Love; p. 2 par. 2).

Claim 3:

Bonney teaches *"each sheet illustrates a certain detail of a model"* (see col. 1

lines 32-33). **(claim 3; i.e., wherein each of the views is associated with a viewport)**

Examiner considers the illustration of the certain detail of a model to be associated with

a viewport because according to the appellant a viewport is a bounded area that

displays some portion of the model space of the model (see p. 7 lines 14-15).

Therefore, the certain detail of a model would be an example of a bounded area that is

displaying a portion of the model space of the model.

Claims 12-14:

Claims 12, 13 and 14 are directed towards an apparatus and are substantially

encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 3 respectively; therefore the apparatus claims

are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 3 above.

Claims 23-25:

Claims 23, 24, and 25 are directed towards manufacture claims and are

substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 3, respectively; therefore the

manufacture claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 3

above.

Claims 4, 15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bonney in view of Love as cited above, in further view of Song,

U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0031380 A1.

Claim 4:

Neither Bonney nor Love expressly teaches representing the view with a

thumbnail preview image.

However, Song's Figure 7 illustrates a thumbnail pane that shows each possible

view represented by a thumbnail preview image (see abstract, par. 44). **(claim 4; i.e.,**

wherein each of the views is represented by a thumbnail preview image displayed

by the Sheet Set Manager.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to manage the views of the drawings generated by Bonney's

computer aided program with the list of views as taught by Love and to display a

thumbnail pane of the views as taught by Song to provide the benefit of allowing the

user to visualize all the possible views of a drawing image at once (see Love; par. 2,

par. 7) (Song; abstract). Thus, utilizing the real estate of the display screen efficiently.

Claim 15:

Claim 15 is directed towards an apparatus and is substantially encompassed in

method claim 4, respectively; therefore the apparatus claim is rejected under the same

rationale as method claim 4 above.

Claim 26:

Claim 26 is directed towards a manufacture claim and is substantially

encompassed in method claim 4, respectively; therefore the manufacture claim is

rejected under the same rationale as method claim 4 above.

Claims 5-11, 16-22 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bonney in view of Love as cited above, in further view of

Kawai, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0043177.

Claim 5:

Neither Bonney nor Love expressly teaches automatically creating different views

for the sheets in response to a user command.

However, Kawai teaches *"the operator (i.e., user) can automatically create the*

exploded view based on the support by the computer" (see p.4 par. 47). **(claim 5; i.e.,**

wherein the Sheet Set Manager automatically creates one or more different views

for the Sheets in response to a user command).

Examiner considers the exploded views illustrated in Figure 8 and Figure 9 to be

the automatic created different views for the drawing sheet in Figure 7 (see Kawai

Figures 7, 8, and 9). The **"All"** and **"first level"** buttons in Figure 7 generate the views

in response to the user selecting the buttons (see Figure 7; ref. #35, ref. #36). The user

can create the exploded view of the design in accordance with an exploded view

creation command (see Kawai; par. 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to attach to Bonny communication bus line, an automatic creation

device to automatically create the exploded view as taught by Kawai using the three-

dimensional computer aided design application data as taught by Bonney and to display

the exploded view as taught by Kawai of the list of views as taught by Love to provide

the benefit of easily obtaining views automatically without the tedious troublesome of

additional drawing operations (see Bonney; Figure 2) (see Love; par. 2, par. 7) (see

Kawai; par. 12 and par. 14).

Claim 6:

Bonney teaches *"hierarchical relationships between sheets can be created,*

modified and/or deleted by dragging and dropping icons displayed on display device

121" (see col. 4 lines 45-49). **(claim 6; i.e., wherein the user command comprises a**

drag-and-drop operation.) Examiner considers the dragging and dropping of icons to

be a drag-and-drop operation by the user.

Claim 7:

Bonney teaches *"the sheet represented by icon 330 may have been stored in a*

separate file" (see col. 6 lines 15-17). **(claim 7; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager**

creates a reference to a file containing the automatically created view.) Examiner

considers the icon serving as a reference to a separate file that contains a sheet. The

sheet represents the automatically created view as explained in the rationale of claim 5.

Claim 8:

Neither Bonney nor Love expressly teaches a viewport displaying a geometric

defined in the automatically created view.

However, Kawai Figure 5 illustrates a bounded area that is displaying a portion of

the model space of the model, which is considered to be a viewport as defined by

appellants' specification (see p. 7 lines 14-15). **(claim 8; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set**

Manager creates a viewport displaying a geometric region defined in the

automatically created view.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to attach to Bonny communication bus line, an automatic creation

device to create a viewport displaying a geometric region for the automatically created

exploded view as taught by Kawai and to display the viewport of the list of views as

taught by Love to provide the benefit of freely specifying the viewing direction of the

viewport for the exploded view. Thus, the automatic exploded view can be displayed

thru various predetermined viewports (see Bonney; Figure 2) (see Love; par. 2, par. 7)

(see Kawai; p. 2 par. 30 and par. 33).

Claim 9:

Bonney teaches *"Fig. 2 is one embodiment of a computer system executing a*

CAD application program that generates objects of the drawing sheets of a design with

a hierarchical relationship" (see col. 3 lines 65-67). **(claim 9; i.e., wherein the**

automatically created view is placed in a hierarchical representation displayed on

the computer.) Examiner considers Figure 2 as an illustration of drawing sheets in a

hierarchical representation on a computer display device (see Figure 2 ref# 121). The

drawing sheet represents the automatically created view as explained in the rationale of

claim 5.

Claim 10:

Bonney teaches *"a reverse update can also be provided. If field 420 of icon 440*

is modified, field 420 of sheet 400 can be automatically updated. Automatic updates are

not limited to fields within title blocks. Any field of component of sheet 400 can be linked

to icon 440" (see col. 6 lines 33-37). **(claim 10; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager**

places a label block associated with the automatically created view into the

Sheet, with fields to display label information for the automatically created view,

which updates automatically if the field's values change.) Examiner considers the

title block of the sheet to be a label block that contains fields that can be automatically

updated when the corresponding icon field changes.

Claim 11:

Neither Bonney nor Love expressly allowing a user to adjust a scale of the

automatically created view.

However, Kawai teaches *"the input screen 26 includes a space 27 for inputting*

the assembling position (i.e., reference position) and a space 28 for inputting the

assembling direction (i.e., three-dimensional direction)" (see par. 33). **(claim 11; i.e.,**

wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows a user to adjust a scale of the

automatically created view.) Examiner considers Kawai's Figure 5 as an illustration of

the scale adjustment performed by the user at the input screen in Kawai's Figure 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to manage the views of the drawings generated by Bonney's

computer aided program with the list of views as taught by Love and to display an input

screen to adjust the scale of a view as taught by Kawai to provide the benefit of the user

predetermining the scale of the automatically created exploded view. Thus, the user has

direct control over the change of positioning of parts constructed from the shape data.

(see Bonney; Figure 2 ref# 220) (see Love; par. 2, par. 7) (see Kawai; abstract, p. 2 par.

30 and par. 33)

Claims 16-22:

Claims 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 are directed towards an apparatus and are

substantially encompassed in method claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, respectively,

therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims

5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 above.

Claims 27-33:

Claims 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 are directed towards manufacture claims

and are substantially encompassed in method claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11,

respectively, therefore the manufacture claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 above.

(10) Response to Argument

A.   Arguments directed to the first grounds for rejection: Whether claims 1-3, 12-14 and 23-25 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,953 (Bonney) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0177089 (Love).

1. Independent claims 1, 12 and 13.

Independent claims 1, 12 and 23 recite the function of Automatic View Creation, such that the Sheet Set Manager presents a user with a list of the views defined in a Sheet Set and the user places a view from the list onto a Sheet to invoke the Automatic View Creation. Neither of the references, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest these limitations.

The Office Action asserts that Bonney teaches a CAD program that is capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager and that Bonney teaches drawings and views, which the Office Action considers to be a set of sheets and subsets of the sheets. However, the Office Action admits that Bonney fails to expressly teach presenting a user with a list of views defined in a Sheet Set and the user placing a view from the list onto a Sheet. Nonetheless, the Office Action asserts that Love teaches that a user can select a view from a list of views and display the drawing containing the selected view.

The Office Action then states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to manage the views of the drawings

generated by Bonney's computer aided program with the list of views as taught by Love

to provide the benefit of an effective identification of separate views in a drawing.

Appellants' attorney disagrees.

For example, at the cited locations in Love, namely paragraphs [0002], [0007]

and [0058], the following is described:

For example, at the cited locations in Love, namely paragraphs [0002], [0007] and [0058], the following is described:

[0002] In designing new products, the designer or engineer can help to reduce costs by being able to retrieve drawings of existing components from a database of drawings in a Computer Aided Design (CAD) system. This can help to prevent unnecessary duplication of component designs or save time by adapting designs of existing components. The effectiveness of a retrieval system depends on its ability to search a large number of drawings of components so as to identify a drawing or drawings of one or more similar components.

[0007] Another problem arises when a drawing comprises more than one view. For example, an engineering drawing of a component may include separate views of different elevations, sectional views or views showing parts of the component in greater detail. Identification of separate views in a drawing represented by a bit-map is difficult because bit-map systems rely on pattern recognition.

[0058] The system allows the designer to enter a drawing or sketch of a required component. The system performs a comparison of the view code for the sketch with the view codes of one or more drawings in the database and determines a similarity index for each view compared. The user can then select the most similar view, or another view from a list of views order of similarity, and display the drawing containing the selected view.

In the above portion of Love, a comparison of views is being performed, not a

view creation. Note that, in Love, the view code for the drawing exists and is compared

to other views in the database to determine the most similar view in another drawing.

However, none of these functions are related to Appellants' claimed invention,

namely presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user places a view from the

list onto a sheet to invoke automatic view creation. Nowhere does Love describe a

similar function. Thus, Appellant's attorney submits that independent claims 1, 12 and

23 are patentable over the combination of Bonney and Love.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner does not rely on "a compassion of views" as described in the above

cited portions to teach a "view creation". Firstly, Examiner notes that Appellant's

specification recites **"In addition to** <u>automatically placing a View onto a Sheet</u>**, the**

automatic view creation function also gives the user the opportunity to adjust the

scale of the View during operation itself" (see spec par. 105). Based on this cited

portion of the specification, Examiner interprets a view creation to be at least capable of

<u>automatically placing a View onto a Sheet</u>. In comparison, Love teaches selecting a

view and displaying a drawing containing the selected view (see par. 58). Therefore,

Examiner interprets selecting a view and displaying a drawing containing the selected

view as taught by Love to anticipate a "view creation" as recited in the claims because

the selected view is automatically placed onto a drawing in response to the user

selection of the view.

Thus, Love does teach or suggest presenting a user with a list of the views,

where the user places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke automatic view

creation.

2. Dependent claims 2, 13 and 24.

Dependent claims 2, 13 and 24 recite that boundaries for the views are re-defined after creation. The Office Action asserts that these limitations are taught by Love at paragraphs [0021--[0023]. However, these paragraphs of Love merely describe identifying the views in a drawings, in order to code the views for later comparison purposes. Nowhere does Love describe re-defining boundaries for views after the views are created, in the same context as Appellants' claimed invention, namely presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke automatic view creation. Thus, Appellants' attorney submits that dependent claims 2, 13 and 24 are patentable over the combination of Bonney and Love.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Essentially, this argument is substantially the same argument previously set forth for claim 1 above. The Examiner has already rebutted this argument by explaining how Love teaches or suggests presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke view creation as indicated above. Therefore, the applied references are in context with Appellants' claimed invention.

Moreover, the Examiner notes that the "comparison" features taught in Love are not used to teach "view creation" in any of the claims.

3. Dependent claims 3, 14 and 25.

Dependent claims 3, 14 and 25 recite that each of the views is associated with a viewport. These claims stand or fall with independent claims 1, 12 and 23.

Applicant arguments with respect to claims 3, 14 and 25 are substantially encompassed in the arguments for claims 1, 12 and 23, therefore examiner responds with the same rationale as stated above.

B.   Arguments directed to the second grounds for rejection; Whether claims 4, 15 and 26 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of the combination of Bonney, Love and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0031380 (Song).

1. Dependent claims 4, 15 and 26.

Dependent claims 4, 15 and 26 recite that each of the views is represented by a thumbnail preview image displayed by the Sheet Set Manager. These claims stand or fall independent 1, 12, and 23.

Applicant arguments with respect to claims 4, 15 and 26 are substantially encompassed in the arguments for claims 1, 12 and 23, therefore examiner responds with the same rationale as stated above.

C.   Arguments directed to the thirds grounds for rejection: Whether claims 5-11, 16-

22 and 27-33 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of the combination of Bonney,

Love and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0043177 (Kawai).

1. Dependent claims 5, 16 and 27.

Dependent claims 5, 16 and 27 recite that the Sheet Set Manager automatically

creates one or more different views for the Sheets in response to a user command. The

Office Action asserts that these limitations are taught by Kawai at paragraph [0047] and

in Figures 7, 8 and 9. However, these paragraphs and Figures of Kawai describe

creating a view in another context, but not in the same context as Appellants claimed

invention, namely presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user places a

view from the list onto a sheet to invoke automatic view creation. Thus, Appellants'

attorney submits that dependent claims 5, 16 and 27 are patentable over the

combination of Bonney, Love and Kawai.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Essentially, this argument is substantially the same argument previously set forth

for claim 1 above. The Examiner has already rebutted this argument by explaining how

Love teaches or suggests presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user

places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke view creation as indicated above.

Therefore, the applied references are in context with Appellants' claimed invention.

2. Dependent claims 6, 17 and 28.

Dependent claims 6, 17 and 28 recite that the user command comprises a drag-and-drop operation. These claims stand or fall with dependent claims [1]5, 16 and 27.

Applicant arguments with respect to claims 6, 17 and 28 are substantially encompassed in the arguments for claims 5, 16 and 27, therefore examiner responds with the same rationale as stated above.

3. Dependent claims 7, 18 and 29.

Dependent claims 7, 18 and 29 recite that the Sheet Set Manager creates a reference to a file containing the automatically created view. The Office Action asserts that these limitations are taught by Bonney at. Col. 6 lines 15-17. However, these paragraphs of Bonney refer to a sheet represented by an icon having been stored in a file, but not a file containing an automatically created view, wherein the view was created in the same context as Appellants' claimed invention, namely presenting a user with a list of the views, Where the user places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke

automatic view creation. Thus, Appellants' attorney submits that dependent claims 7, 18

and 29 are patentable over the combination of Bonney, Love and Kawai.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Essentially, this argument is substantially the same argument previously set forth

for claim 1 above. The Examiner has already rebutted this argument by explaining how

Love teaches or suggests presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user

places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke view creation as indicated above.

Therefore, the applied references are in context with Appellants' claimed invention.

4. Dependent claims 8, 19 and 30.

Dependent claims 8, 19 and 30 recite that the Sheet Set Manager creates a

viewport displaying a geometric region defined in the automatically created view. The

Office Action asserts that these limitations are taught by Kawai in Figure 5. However,

this Figure of Kawai merely refers to a view, but not a viewport for an automatically

created view, wherein the view was created in the same context as Appellants' claimed

invention, namely presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user places a

view from the list onto a sheet to invoke automatic view creation. Thus, Appellants'

attorney submits that dependent claims 8, 19 and 30 are patentable over the

combination of Bonney, Love and Kawai.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Essentially, this argument is substantially the same argument previously set forth

for claim 1 above. The Examiner has already rebutted this argument by explaining how

Love teaches or suggests presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user

places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke view creation as indicated above.

Therefore, the applied references are in context with Appellants' claimed invention.

5.   Dependent claims 9, 20 and 31.

Dependent claims 9, 20 and 31 recite that the automatically created view is

placed in a hierarchical representation displayed on the computer. The Office Action

asserts that these limitations are taught by Bonney in Figure 2. However, this Figure of

Bonney merely refers to a hierarchical representation of drawings, but not an

automatically created view in a hierarchical representation, wherein the view was

created in the same context as Appellants' claimed invention, namely presenting a user

with a list of the views, where the user places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke

automatic view creation. Thus, Appellants' attorney submits that dependent claims 9, 20

and 31 are patentable over the combination of Bonney, Love and Kawai.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Essentially, this argument is substantially the same argument previously set forth

for claim 1 above. The Examiner has already rebutted this argument by explaining how

Love teaches or suggests presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user

places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke view creation as indicated above.

Therefore, the applied references are in context with Appellants' claimed invention.

6. Dependent claims 10, 21 and 32.

Dependent claims 10, 21, and 32 recite that the Sheet Set Manager places a

label block associated with the automatically created view into the Sheet, with fields to

display label information for the automatically created view, which updates automatically

if the field's values change. The Office Action asserts that these limitations are taught by

Bonney at. Col. 6, lines 33-37. However, this portion of Bonney merely refers to a field

of a subset that is automatically updated, but not a label block associated with an

automatically created view, wherein the view was created in the same context as

Appellants' claimed invention, namely presenting a user with a list of the views, where

the user places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke automatic view creation. Thus

Appellants' attorney submits that dependent claims 10, 21 and 32 are patentable over

the combination of Bonney, Love and Kawai.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Essentially, this argument is substantially the same argument previously set forth for claim 1 above. The Examiner has already rebutted this argument by explaining how Love teaches or suggests presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke view creation as indicated above. Therefore, the applied references are in context with Appellants' claimed invention.

7.   Dependent claims 11, 22 and 33.

Dependent claims 11, 22 and 33 recite that the Sheet Set Manager allows a user to adjust a scale of the automatically created view. The Office Action asserts that these limitations are taught by Kawai at paragraph [0033]. However, this portion of Kawai merely refers to the user's ability to input or specify a reference position (assembling position) and a direction (assembling direction) when constructing an assembly drawing, but not adjusting the scale of an automatically created view, wherein the view was created in the same context as Appellants' claimed invention, namely presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke automatic view creation. Thus, Appellants' attorney submits that dependent claims 11, 22 and 33 are patentable over the combination of Bonney, Love and Kawai.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Essentially, this argument is substantially the same argument previously set forth for claim 1 above. The Examiner has already rebutted this argument by explaining how

Love teaches or suggests presenting a user with a list of the views, where the user

places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke view creation as indicated above.

Therefore, the applied references are in context with Appellants' claimed invention.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Henry Orr/

Conferees:

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100